arXiv:1501.06978v1 [math.PR] 28 Jan 2015

# Pathwise Viscosity Solutions of Stochastic PDEs and Forward Path-Dependent PDEs

Rainer Buckdahn[*], Jin Ma[†] and Jianfeng Zhang[‡§]

January 29, 2015

## Abstract

In this paper we propose a new notion of pathwise viscosity solution for a fairly large class of fully nonlinear (forward) Stochastic PDEs whose diffusion term is allowed to depend on both the solution and its gradient. With the help of the newly developed pathwise analysis in the sense of Dupire [10], we shall identify a forward SPDE as a *Path-dependent PDE*. We then propose a notion of (pathwise) viscosity solution to the PPDE in terms of the pathwise stochastic Taylor expansion, developed in our previous work [5] within Dupire's pathwise analysis paradigm. Under some general assumptions on the coefficients, we prove the wellposedness of the viscosity solution: consistency, stability, existence, comparison principle and uniqueness.

**Keywords.** Pathwise Taylor expansion, stochastic PDEs, path dependent PDEs, pathwise viscosity solutions.

*2000 AMS Mathematics subject classification:* 60H07,15,30; 35R60, 34F05.

---

[*] Département de Mathématiques, Université de Bretagne-Occidentale, F-29285 Brest Cedex, France; and School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, P.R. China. Email: Rainer.Buckdahn@univ-brest.fr.

[†] Department of Mathematics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 90089, USA. Email: jinma@usc.edu. This author is supported in part by US NSF grant #1106853.

[‡] Department of Mathematics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA. E-mail: jianfenz@usc.edu. This author is supported in part by NSF grant #1413717.

[§] The authors would like to thank Remigijus Mikulevicius for many helpful discussions concerning the classical theory of SPDEs.

# 1 Introduction

In this paper we are interested in the following general fully nonlinear SPDE:

$$u(t,x,\omega) = u_0(x) + \int_0^t f(s,x,\omega,u,\partial_x u,\partial^2_{xx}u)ds + \int_0^t g(s,x,\omega,u,\partial_x u)\circ dB_s, \qquad (1.1)$$

where $(t,x) \in [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}$, $B$ is a $d$-dimensional Brownian motion defined on a given probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$, and $f$ and $g$ are $\mathbb{F}^B$-progressively measurable random fields with appropriate dimensions. The main purpose of this paper is to recast the SPDE as a (forward) Path-dependent PDE (PPDE), with the help of the newly developed "path-derivatives" of Dupire [10], and connect the notion of the *stochastic viscosity solution* of the SPDE with the (pathwise) viscosity solution of the PPDE so as to obtain a sensible definition of the set of test functions which guarantee the well-posedness result.

The notion of stochastic viscosity solution for stochastic PDEs of parabolic type has been around since the seminal papers of Lions and Souganidis [22, 23] at the end of last century. During the past decade, there have been serious efforts to find the proper definition of viscosity solutions for a general (forward) SPDE of the form (1.1), (see, e.g., Lions and Souganidis [24, 25, 26], Buckdahn and Ma [1, 2, 3], Caruana, Friz and Oberhauser [8], Buckdahn, Bulla and Ma [4], Diehl and Friz [9], and Friz and Oberhauser [15].) The main difficulty can be roughly described as the conflict between the "local nature" of the viscosity theory and the "global nature" of the stochastic analysis. In particular, the understanding of the pathwise behavior, or the lack of it, on the SPDE and its solution has often been the main obstacle for establishing a general theory.

There are typically two approaches to attack the problem, as was proposed in [22]. The first one is to use the stochastic characteristics (cf. Kunita [20]) to remove the stochastic integrals, and then define the stochastic viscosity solution via the corresponding deterministic PDEs with "parameter" $\omega$. The works [1, 2, 3, 4] follow this line. The main challenges in this approach are: (i) the stochastic characteristics exist only locally for general SPDEs; (ii) the deterministic PDE (derived along the characteristics) could become extremely complex and its uniqueness is hardly tractable. The second approach is to approximate the Brownian motion paths by smooth paths and the solution is defined as the limit, if exist, of the solutions to the approximating equations. The works [8, 9, 15] follow this line, in the framework of rough path theory. In this approach, the solutions are defined pathwisely in $\omega$, but *globally* in $(t,x)$. Moreover, it is noted that in this case the uniqueness is actually free, but the existence (namely the existence of the limit) is very challenging and thus requires some special structures of the coefficients.

The first goal of this paper is to propose a new definition of viscosity solution for the general SPDE (1.1), by introducing test functions directly for the original SPDE, without removing the stochastic integrals. Our main tool is the functional Itô calculus of Dupire [10] (see also Cont and Fournie [7]) and thus the definition is in a pathwise manner. Such a language has received strong attention in recent years and has proven to be very convenient for viscosity theory of backward Path-dependent PDEs (see Ekren, Keller, Touzi and Zhang [11], and Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [12, 13]).

Specifically, we shall first recast the SPDE (1.1) into the following system of PPDEs:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t,x,\omega) = f(t,x,\omega,u,\partial_x u,\partial^2_{xx} u), \quad \partial_\omega u(t,x,\omega) = g(t,x,\omega,u,\partial_x u); \\ u(0,x,\omega) = u_0(t,\omega). \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\partial_t$ and $\partial_\omega$ are the path-derivatives in the spirit of Dupire (see §2 for detailed definitions). Then, with the help of the new pathwise stochastic Taylor expansion presented in our recent paper [5], we introduce a definition of (pathwise) viscosity solution for PPDE (1.2), whence SPDE (1.1), via test functions. More precisely, for fixed $\omega$, we characterize the *smoothness* of a deterministic function (in variables $(t,x)$) in terms of the (pathwise) Taylor expansions, and then define the test functions as those smooth functions that satisfy the desired viscosity properties. We shall justify our definition by proving the following consistency: *a smooth function is a viscosity solution if and only if it is a classical solution.*

We remark that, by definition our viscosity property is $\omega$-wise and local in $(t,x)$. However, our definition of viscosity solution (via test functions) is slightly weaker than the alternative definition via semi-jets, which are equivalent in standard PDE viscosity theory. This is due to our extra requirement that the temporal derivative $\partial_t^\omega \varphi$ of the test functions $\varphi$ is continuous in $(t,x)$ for each fixed $\omega$, which seems to be crucial for the stability of our viscosity solutions. Moreover, while our definition does not involve stochastic characteristics directly, the constraint $\partial_\omega u(t,x,\omega) = g(t,x,\omega,u,\partial_x u)$ has the flavor of stochastic characteristic. Their precise connection needs to be understood further.

Our second goal of this paper is to establish the wellposedness of the viscosity solutions, including stability, existence, comparison principle and uniqueness. As in [11, 12, 13] which deal with backward PPDEs, the building block is the following *partial comparison principle*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Let } u \text{ be a viscosity subsolution and } v \text{ a classical supersolution of PPDE (3.1).} \\ \text{If } u \le v \text{ on the boundary, then } u \le v \text{ in the whole domain.} \end{array} \tag{1.3}$$

We note that the proof of (1.3) is much easier than the complete comparison principle because in this case one may use the smooth function $v$ to construct a test function for the viscosity subsolution $u$ and to derive the desired contradiction. Furthermore, combining (1.3) and the stability result, with certain approximation arguments we can derive both existence and comparison principle, whence the uniqueness, for viscosity solutions.

We should remark that in this paper we are aiming at the most general form of second order parabolic SPDEs, and some abstract conditions will be imposed to ensure the validity of our arguments. In particular, the consistency and the partial comparison principle hold true for the fairly general form of $g = g(t, x, \omega, \partial_x u)$, under some mild and natural conditions, but other results may require some stronger assumptions. For example, we shall assume the existence of local classical solutions of certain mollified SPDEs, which in general is a very challenging problem to verify. We shall nevertheless further explore these assumptions in our subsequent paper [6]. Particularly, in the semilinear case where

$$\begin{cases} f = f_0(t, x, \omega, u, \partial_x u) + a(t, x, \omega)\partial^2_{xx} u; \\ g = g_0(t, x, \omega, u) + \sigma(t, x, \omega)\partial_x u, \end{cases}$$

we shall verify all the conditions imposed in present paper and thus establish the wellposedness completely.

Finally, we would like to mention that when we were finalizing technical details for the wellposedness results of this paper, we learned the highly relevant recent work Gubinelli, Tindel and Torrecilla [16]. It is noted that the main purpose of [16] is to propose a notion of viscosity solution in the framework of rough path theory, but the wellposedness issue was not investigated in a general setting. However, we also note that despite the different languages and many technical differences, the definition of [16] and the one in this paper is quite close, if not equivalent. It is thus an interesting task to explore the possibility of unifying the two languages into one, as partially done recently in Keller and Zhang [18]. We hope to address this issue in our future publications.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we give all the notations, and recall the main results in our previous work [5]. In section 3 we introduce the definition of the *classical* and *pathwise viscosity solutions* for the SPDE (1.1) and the corresponding (forward) path-dependent PDEs (PPDEs). In section 4 we present the *Partial Comparison Principles* for PPDEs, and in section 5 we prove the well-posedness of the PPDEs (whence the SPDE) in the sense of viscosity solutions. Finally in Section 6 we provide some concluding remarks.

## 2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we consider the following *canonical probability space*. Let $\Omega := \{\omega \in C([0,\infty), \mathbb{R}^d) : \omega_0 = \mathbf{0}\}$ be the set of continuous paths starting from the origin, endowed with the standard metric, $B$ the canonical process on $\Omega$, $\mathcal{F} = \mathscr{B}(\Omega)$ be the topological Borel field, $\mathbb{P}_0$ the Wiener measure, and $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ the $\mathbb{P}_0$-augmented filtration generated by $B$. The following sets will be used frequently in the paper:

$$Q := (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}, \quad \overline{Q} := [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}, \quad \Lambda := \overline{Q}\times\Omega. \tag{2.1}$$

Here and in the sequel, we use $\mathbf{0}$ to denote vectors or matrices with appropriate dimensions whose components are all equal to 0, and for any dimension $m$, we take the convention that $\mathbb{R}^m := \mathbb{R}^{m\times 1}$ denotes the set of column vectors. Define

$$x\cdot x' := \sum_{i=1}^m x_i x_i' \;\text{ for any }\; x,x'\in\mathbb{R}^m, \quad \gamma:\gamma' := \mathrm{tr}\,[\gamma(\gamma')^T] \;\text{ for any }\; \gamma,\gamma'\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n},$$

and $|x|^2 := x\cdot x$, $|\gamma|^2 := \gamma:\gamma$. Here ${}^T$ denotes the transpose. Moreover, let $\mathbb{S}^m$ denote the set of $m\times m$-symmetric matrices.

Let $\mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda,\mathbb{R}^{m\times n})$ denote the set of $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes $u:\Lambda\to\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, and $\mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda,\mathbb{R}^{m\times n})$ the subset of $u\in\mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda,\mathbb{R}^{m\times n})$ such that the mapping $(t,x)\mapsto u(t,x,\omega)$ is continuous for $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.e. $\omega$. Denote $\mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda) := \mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda,\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda) := \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda,\mathbb{R})$. Given $u\in\mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$, we define its derivative in $x$ in the standard way. Moreover, strongly motivated by the functional Itô formula initiated by Dupire [10], in [5] we introduced the notion of path-derivatives as follows. Let $u\in\mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$ be a semimartingale (for any fixed $x$) taking the following form:

$$u(t,x,\cdot) = u_0(x) + A_t(x) + \int_0^t \beta_s(x)\cdot dB_s, \quad t\geq 0, \tag{2.2}$$

such that $V_0^t(A(x)) + \int_0^t |\beta_s(x)|^2 ds < \infty$, for all $(t,x)\in[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s., where $V_0^t(A(x))$ is the total variation of process $A(x)$ on $[0,t]$, and $\beta\in\mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda,\mathbb{R}^d)$.

**Definition 2.1.** *Let $u\in\mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$ be given by (2.2). We define: for fixed $x\in\mathbb{R}^{d'}$,*

$$\partial_\omega u(t,x,\cdot) := \beta_t(x), \quad \mathbb{P}_0\text{-}a.s. \tag{2.3}$$

*Furthermore, if $\beta(x)$ is also a semimartingale and $A_t(x) = \int_0^t \alpha_s(x)ds$ for some $\alpha\in\mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda)$, then:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial^2_{\omega\omega}u(t,x) := \partial_\omega\beta_t(x) = \partial_\omega([\partial_\omega u(t,x)]^T); \quad \text{and} \\ \partial_t u(t,x) := \alpha_t(x) - \dfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,(\partial^2_{\omega\omega}u(t,x)). \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

It is not hard to check that the path derivatives, whenever exist, are unique in the sense of $\mathbb{P}_0$-almost surely.

**Remark 2.2.** If the path derivatives $\partial_t u, \partial_\omega u, \partial^2_{\omega\omega} u$ all exist, then we must have $\alpha = \partial_t u + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,(\partial^2_{\omega\omega} u)$ and $\beta = \partial_\omega u$. In other words, the following *functional Itô formula* holds: for $t \ge 0$,

$$u(t,x) = u_0(x) + \int_0^t [\partial_t u + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,(\partial^2_{\omega\omega} u)](s,x)ds + \int_0^t \partial_\omega u(s,x) \cdot dB_s, \quad \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.5}$$

In particular, this implies that the mapping $t \mapsto u(t,x)$ is continuous, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s. Moreover, denoting $\circ dB$ as the Stratonovich integration, we have

$$u(t,x) = u_0(x) + \int_0^t \partial_t u(s,x)ds + \int_0^t \partial_\omega u(s,x) \circ dB_s, \quad \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.s.}, \tag{2.6}$$

which is a much more intuitive form. ■

We note that by differentiating the equation (2.6) and using the definition of the path-derivative, one easily checks that

$$\partial_\omega(\partial_x u(t,x)) = \partial_x(\partial_\omega u(t,x)), \quad \partial_t(\partial_x u(t,x)) = \partial_x(\partial_t u(t,x)), \quad \forall (t,x), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

That is, $\partial_x$ commutes with $\partial_t$ and $\partial_\omega$. However, in general $\partial_t$ and $\partial_{\omega^i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, d$, do not commute. In particular, the matrix $\partial^2_{\omega\omega} u$ is in general not symmetric, and consequently, the following notion of *Lévy area* $A_{s,t}$ will be important in our pathwise Taylor expansion below. For $0 \le s < t$, we define

$$B_{s,t} := B_t - B_s, \quad A_{s,t} := [a^{i,j}_{s,t}]_{1 \le i,j \le d}, \quad a^{i,j}_{s,t} := \int_s^t B^i_{s,r} \circ dB^j_r - \int_s^t B^j_{s,r} \circ dB^i_r. \tag{2.7}$$

We would emphasize here that the Lévy area $A_{s,t}$ can be defined pathwisely, thanks to the pathwise stochastic integration by Karandikar [17].

Clearly all the aforementioned derivatives can be extended to any order. Bearing in mind the non-commutative property of $\partial_t$ and $\partial_\omega$, we recall the following differentiation operators introduced in [5]. For multi-indices $\theta = (\theta_1, \tilde{\theta}) = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \cdots, \theta_n) \in \{0, \cdots, d\}^n$, and $\ell = (\ell_1, \cdots, \ell_{d'}) \in \mathbb{N}^{d'}$, define

$$\partial_0 u := \partial_t u; \quad \partial_i u := \partial_{\omega^i} u, \ 1 \le i \le d; \quad \mathcal{D}^\theta_\omega u := \partial_{\theta_1}(\mathcal{D}^{\tilde{\theta}}_\omega u), \quad \mathcal{D}^\ell_x u := \partial^{\ell_1}_{x_1} \cdots \partial^{\ell_{d'}}_{x_{d'}} u, \tag{2.8}$$

and we also introduce the following norms:

$$|\theta|_0 := n, \quad |\theta| := |\theta|_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_i = 0\}}, \quad |\ell| = \sum_{i=1}^{d'} \ell_i, \quad |(\theta,\ell)| := |\theta| + |\ell|. \tag{2.9}$$

Next, recall the following spaces in terms of the norms in (2.9): for $n \geq 0$ and $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{C}^n(\Lambda) &:= \Big\{u \in \mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda) : \mathcal{D}_x^\ell \mathcal{D}_\omega^\theta u \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda) \text{ for all } |(\theta,\ell)| \leq n\Big\};\\
\mathcal{H}_p^n(\Lambda) &:= \Big\{u \in \mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda) : \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{x\in K} |\mathcal{D}_x^\ell \mathcal{D}_\omega^\theta u(t,x)|^p\Big] < \infty,\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{for all } |(\theta,\ell)| \leq n, T > 0, K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^{d'}\Big\};\\
W_p^n(\Lambda) &:= \Big\{u \in \mathbb{L}^0(\Lambda) : \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_K |\mathcal{D}_x^\ell u(t,x)|^p dx\Big] < \infty,\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{for all } |\ell| \leq n, T > 0, K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^{d'}\Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Here and in the sequel, "$\subset\subset$" indicates that the subset is compact. Consequently, by definition we must have $\mathcal{H}_p^{n+2}(\Lambda) \subset \mathbb{C}^n(\Lambda)$.

## 2.1 Stochastic PDEs vs. Path-dependent PDEs

We now introduce the main object of this paper: the (forward) path-dependent PDEs in terms of the pathwise stochastic analysis introduced before. Consider the following SPDE:

$$du(t,x) = f(t,x,u,\partial_x u, \partial_{xx}^2 u)dt + g(t,x,u,\partial_x u) \circ dB_t, \quad \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.11}$$

where $f : \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{S}^{d'} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ are $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable in all variables, with the variable $\omega$ omitted as usual. We note that the SPDE is forward in the sense that an initial condition $u(0,x) = u_0(x)$ will be given.

Throughout the paper, we shall use the following standing assumptions.

**Assumption 2.3.** *(i) The mapping $\gamma \mapsto f(t,x,y,z,\gamma)$ is increasing in the sense that $\partial_\gamma f = [\partial_{\gamma_{ij}} f]_{i,j=1}^{d'} \geq 0$, as a matrix. Namely, the SPDE is parabolic;*

*(ii) $f$ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in $(y,z,\gamma)$ and $g$ is differentiable in $(y,z)$ with uniformly bounded derivatives.*

*(iii) for any fixed $(y,z,\gamma)$, $f(\cdot,y,z,\gamma) \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$ and $g(\cdot,y,z) \in \mathbb{C}^1(\Lambda)$.* ■

We remark that Assumption 2.3 (iii) implies $g(t,x,u,\partial_x u) \circ dB_t$ in (2.11) is well-defined for $u \in \mathbb{C}^2(\Lambda)$. We first give the definition of the "classical solution".

**Definition 2.4.** *We say $u \in \mathbb{C}^2(\Lambda)$ is a classical solution of SPDE* (2.11) *if it satisfies* (2.11) *on $\Lambda$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s.* ■

Next, using the definition of the path-derivative, one can easily see that the SPDE (2.11) can be written in an equivalent form (recall (2.6)):

$$\partial_t u = f(t,x,u,\partial_x u, \partial_{xx}^2 u), \quad \partial_\omega u(t,x) = g(t,x,u,\partial_x u). \tag{2.12}$$

In what follows we call the system of randomized PDEs in (2.12) the *(forward) path dependent PDE* (PPDE, for short) corresponding to SPDE (2.11). Clearly, since they are equivalent under the language of pathwise stochastic analysis, our main idea is to equate their well-posedness, both in the classical sense and in the sense of viscosity solutions.

We first observe that, by differentiating the second equation in (2.12) with respect to $x$ we get (suppressing the variables and noting that $g = (g_1, \cdots, g_d)^T$):

$$\partial^2_{x_i\omega^j} u = \partial_{x_i}\big(g_j(t,x,u(t,x),\partial_x u(t,x))\big) = \partial_{x_i} g_j + \partial_y g_j \partial_{x_i} u + \sum_{k=1}^{d'} [\partial_{z_k} g_j] \partial^2_{x_i x_k} u, \tag{2.13}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, d'$, and $j = 1, \cdots, d$, or in matrix form

$$\partial^2_{x\omega} u \;=\; [\partial_{x_i\omega^j} u]_{1\le i\le d', 1\le j\le d} \;=\; \partial_x g + \partial_x u [\partial_y g]^T + \partial^2_{xx} u\, \partial_z g \in \mathbb{R}^{d'\times d}. \tag{2.14}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2_{\omega\omega} u &= \partial_\omega g + \partial_\omega u [\partial_y g]^T + [\partial^2_{x\omega} u]^T [\partial_z g] \\ &= \partial_\omega g + g[\partial_y g]^T + \big[\partial_x g + \partial_x u[\partial_y g]^T + \partial^2_{xx} u\, \partial_z g\big]^T [\partial_z g]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

In particular, we note that (2.15) tells us that we may rewrite SPDE (2.11) in Itô form:

$$du(t,x) = F(t,x,u,\partial_x u, \partial^2_x u)dt + g(t,x,u,\partial_x u)dB_t, \quad \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.16}$$

where, with $\theta := (x,y,z,\gamma)$,

$$F(t,\theta) := \Big(f + \frac{1}{2}\Big[\partial_\omega g + g[\partial_y g]^T + \big[\partial_x g + z[\partial_y g]^T + \gamma\, \partial_z g\big]^T [\partial_z g]\Big]\Big)(t,\theta). \tag{2.17}$$

We remark that in this case the parabolicity condition (Assumption 2.3-(i)) amounts to saying that $\partial_\gamma f = \partial_\gamma F - \frac{1}{2}[\partial_z g][\partial_z g]^T \ge \mathbf{0}$, which is commonly used in the literature (see e.g. [31] and [27]).

## 2.2 Pathwise Taylor expansions.

We are now ready to introduce the main element of our definition, the pathwise stochastic Taylor expansion that we derived in our previous work [5]. We begin with the following result [5, Theorem 5.2].

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let* $u \in \mathcal{H}^4_p(\Lambda)$ *for some* $p > p_* := 3d' + 2$. *Then for any* $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}[1 - \frac{p_*}{p}]$, *we have the following pathwise backward Taylor expansion: for* $\mathbb{P}_0$*-a.e.* $\omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(t-\delta, x+h) = \Big[& u - \partial_t u \delta + \partial_x u \cdot h - \partial_\omega u \cdot B_{t-\delta,t} + \frac{1}{2}\partial^2_{xx} u : hh^T - \partial_{x\omega} u : h[B_{t-\delta,t}]^T \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\partial^2_{\omega\omega} u : B_{t-\delta,t} B^T_{t-\delta,t} + \frac{1}{2}\partial^2_{\omega\omega} u : A_{t-\delta,t}\Big](t,x) + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

*for all* $(t,x,\delta,h) \in \hat{Q}$, *where*

$$\hat{Q} := \Big\{(t,x,\delta,h) : (t,x) \in Q, (\delta,h) \in (0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^{d'}\Big\}. \tag{2.19}$$

The case that is of special interest to us is when the Taylor expansion (2.18) is applied to the solution of SPDE (2.11), or PPDE (2.12). We note that if we follow the calculations (2.13)-(2.15), then (2.18) becomes: with $u$ taking value at $(t,x)$,

$$u(t-\delta, x+h) = u + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}\Big(t,x,u,\partial_x u, \partial^2_{xx}u, f(t,x,u,\partial_x u,\partial^2_{xx}u)\Big) + o\big([\delta+|h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big), \tag{2.20}$$

where, with $g$ taking value at $(t,x,y,z)$, for all $(a,z,\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}\times\mathbb{S}^{d'}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(t,x,y,z,\gamma,a) := -a\delta + z\cdot h - g\cdot B_{t-\delta,t} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma : hh^T\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\Big[\partial_\omega g + g[\partial_y g]^T + \Big[\partial_x g + z[\partial_y g]^T + \gamma\,\partial_z g\Big]^T[\partial_z g]\Big] : \Big[B_{t-\delta,t}B^T_{t-\delta,t} + A_{t-\delta,t}\Big]\\
&\quad-\Big[\partial_x g + z[\partial_y g]^T + \gamma\,\partial_z g\Big] : hB^T_{t-\delta,t}\\
&= -a\delta + z\cdot h - g\cdot B_{t-\delta,t} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma : (h - \partial_z g B_{t-\delta,t})(h-\partial_z g B_{t-\delta,t})^T\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\Big[\partial_\omega g + g[\partial_y g]^T + \Big[\partial_x g + z[\partial_y g]^T\Big]^T[\partial_z g]\Big] : \Big[B_{t-\delta,t}B^T_{t-\delta,t} + A_{t-\delta,t}\Big]\\
&\quad-\Big[\partial_x g + z[\partial_y g]^T\Big] : hB^T_{t-\delta,t}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Here we used the facts that $\gamma \in \mathbb{S}^{d'}$ is symmetric and $A_{t-\delta,t}$ is antisymmetric, and thus

$$[\partial_z g]^T\gamma[\partial_z g] : A_{t-\delta,t} = 0.$$

The following result, which provides some sufficient conditions for the regularity $\mathcal{H}^4_p(\Lambda)$, is a special case of Proposition 7.3 (with $m=4$) and Theorem 7.1 of our previous work [5]. We note that in the following statements we shall include the spatial derivatives to those involving $(y,z,\gamma)$, which are defined in an obvious way.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let* $p > p_* := 3d'+2$, *and denote* $p_4 := 11p$. *Assume that*

*(i) for any* $|\theta| \le 3$, $\mathcal{D}^\ell_x\mathcal{D}^{\tilde{\ell}}_{(y,z)}\mathcal{D}^\theta_\omega g$ *exists for all* $|\ell| + |\tilde{\ell}| \le 4 - |\theta|$, *and is uniformly bounded when* $|\tilde{\ell}| \ge 1$. *Moreover,* $\mathcal{D}^\ell_x\mathcal{D}^\theta_\omega g$ *is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in* $(y,z)$ *and* $\mathcal{D}^\ell_x\mathcal{D}^\theta_\omega g(\cdot,0,\mathbf{0}) \in W^0_{p_4}(\Lambda)$ *for* $|\ell| \le 4-|\theta|$.

*(ii) for any* $|\theta| \le 2$, $\mathcal{D}^\ell_x\mathcal{D}^{\tilde{\ell}}_{(y,z,\gamma)}\mathcal{D}^\theta_\omega f$ *exists for all* $|\ell| + |\tilde{\ell}| \le 3 - |\theta|$, *and is uniformly bounded when* $|\tilde{\ell}| \ge 1$. *Moreover,* $\mathcal{D}^\ell_x\mathcal{D}^\theta_\omega f$ *is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in* $(y,z,\gamma)$ *and* $\mathcal{D}^\ell_x\mathcal{D}^\theta_\omega f(\cdot,0,\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) \in W^0_{p_4}(\Lambda)$ *for* $|\ell| \le 3-|\theta|$.

*Let* $u \in W^5_{p_4}(\Lambda)$ *be a classical solution (in the standard sense with differentiability in* $x$ *only) to SPDE (2.11), then* $u \in \mathcal{H}^4_p(\Lambda) \subset \mathbb{C}^2(\Lambda)$. *Consequently, for any* $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}[1 - \frac{p_*}{p}]$, *for* $\mathbb{P}_0$*-a.e.* $\omega$, *the pathwise Taylor expansion* (2.20) *holds for all* $(t,x,\delta,h) \in \hat{Q}$.

**Remark 2.7.** We remark that the regularity requirement in Lemma 2.6 is rather strong, which means not every classical solution to SPDE (2.11) or PPDE (2.12) can have a Taylor expansion. But on the other hand, this also means we shall add the Taylor expansion as an extra index of "regularity". We should note that the regularity in this form is important in our pathwise analysis, which resembles some aspects in rough path theory (cf. e.g. [14]). We shall provide some sufficient conditions in our forthcoming work [6], especially in the case of semilinear SPDEs. ■

# 3 Pathwise viscosity solution of forward PPDEs

In this section we will introduce the notion of (pathwise) viscosity solutions to the SPDE (2.11), or equivalently, that of PPDE (2.12). For notational simplicity, in what follows we shall rewrite (2.12) as:

$$\mathcal{L}u(t,x) := \partial_t u(t,x) - f(t,x,u,\partial_x u,\partial^2_{xx}u) = 0, \quad \partial_\omega u(t,x) = g(t,x,u,\partial_x u). \tag{3.1}$$

We note again that our PPDE is forward in the sense that initial condition $u(0,x)$ will be given, which is quite different from the backward PPDEs in [11, 12, 13] where the terminal condition at $t=T$ is given.

## 3.1 Classical solutions of PPDE

As was indicated in Remark 2.7, a classical solution in the sense of Definition 2.4 may not have the desired Taylor expansion, which will be crucial in our discussion. We therefore first introduce a strong version of classical solution for PPDE (3.1). We begin by introducing the following space on which the classical solutions will be defined.

Let coefficients $f$ and $g$ be given, and assume that they satisfy Assumption 2.3. Recall the operator $\mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h} = \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(t,x,\omega,y,z,\gamma,a)$ defined by (2.21), for $(t,x,\omega)\in\Lambda$ and $(y,z,\gamma,a)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}\times\mathbb{S}^{d'}\times\mathbb{R}$.

**Definition 3.1.** *For any $\alpha>0$, let $\hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g}(\Lambda)$ denote the set of all processes $u\in C^2(\Lambda)$, such that for $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$, it holds that*

$$u(t-\delta,x+h) = u(t,x) + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}\Big(\cdot,u,\partial_x u,\partial^2_{xx}u,\partial_t u\Big)(t,x) + o\big([\delta+|h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big), \tag{3.2}$$

*for all $(t,x,\delta,h)\in\hat{Q}$, as $\delta+|h|^2\to 0$. Furthermore, we define $\hat{C}^{1,2}_g(\Lambda) := \cup_{\alpha>0}\hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g}(\Lambda)$.* ■

Clearly, the space $\hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g}(\Lambda)$ combines the usual "differentiability" in the pathwise sense, and the "expansibility" in terms of stochastic Taylor expansion to the order "$2+\alpha$", for some $\alpha > 0$. We also note that $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$ implies $\hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha_1,g}(\Lambda) \subseteq \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha_2,g}(\Lambda)$.

We now define the "classical solution" to PPDE (3.1) as follows.

**Definition 3.2.** *$u \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_g(\Lambda)$ is called a classical solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) of PPDE* (3.1) *if*

$$\mathcal{L}u(\cdot,\cdot) = (\textit{resp. } \le, \ge) 0 \textit{ and } \partial_\omega u(\cdot,\cdot) = g(\cdot,\cdot,u,\partial_x u), \textit{ on } \Lambda,\ \mathbb{P}_0\textit{-a.s.}$$

Intuitively, a classical solution of PPDE (3.1) should be a classical solution to SPDE (2.11), but the converse is far from clear. The following result establishes the connection between classical solutions in the sense of Definitions 2.4 and 3.2. To this end, we denote

$$\mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda) := \cup_{p>p_*} \mathcal{H}^4_p(\Lambda). \tag{3.3}$$

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let Assumption 2.3 hold and $u \in \mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda)$. Then $u$ is a classical solution to SPDE* (2.11) *if and only if it is a classical solution of PPDE* (3.1).

**Proof** If $u$ is a classical solution of SPDE (2.11), plugging (2.12)-(2.15) into (2.18) we see that $u \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_g(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{L}u = 0$. That is, $u$ is a classical solution of PPDE (3.1). On the other hand, if $u \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_g(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{L}u = 0$, then, by comparing (2.18) and (3.2), we see that (2.12) holds. This, together with (2.6), implies that $u$ is a classical solution of SPDE (2.11). ■

## 3.2 Viscosity solutions of PPDEs

We now turn to the notion of (pathwise) viscosity solution of PPDE (3.1). We begin with identifying the appropriate set of test functions. Note that it is crucially important to find the right set of functions, which should not be too large so that the existence is verifiable, and not be too small either so that the uniqueness is still possible. In light of [4], we shall first localize the random fields (both temporally and $\omega$-wisely), via the pathwise Taylor expansion. The following definition is thus useful.

**Definition 3.4.** *Let $0 \le t_1 < t_2$, $\omega \in \Omega$, $\alpha \ge 0$, and $O \subset \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ open. We say that $\varphi \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}((t_1,t_2]\times O)$ if $\varphi \in C^{0,2}([t_1,t_2]\times O)$ and there exists $\partial^\omega_t \varphi \in C^0((t_1,t_2]\times O)$ such that, for any $(t,x) \in (t_1,t_2]\times O$ and $(t,x,\delta,h) \in \hat{Q}$,*

$$\varphi(t-\delta, x+h) = \varphi(t,x) + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(\cdot,\cdot,\varphi,\partial_x\varphi,\partial^2_{xx}\varphi,\partial^\omega_t\varphi)(t,x) + o\big([\delta+|h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big), \tag{3.4}$$

*where $\mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h} = \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(t,\omega,x,y,z,\gamma,a)$ is defined by (2.21).* ■

We should note here that for each fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, the elements in $\hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}((t_1,t_2] \times O)$ are *deterministic* functions. Moreover, it is clear that for $u \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g}(\Lambda)$, it holds that

$$\varphi := u(\cdot,\omega) \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}(\Lambda), \quad \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.e. } \omega, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial^\omega_t \varphi = \partial_t u(\cdot,\omega). \tag{3.5}$$

We now define the test functions for the pathwise viscosity solution for a given random field $u \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$ at any fixed $(t,x,\omega) \in \Lambda$. Consider the following two sets:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t,x,\omega) &:= \Big\{\varphi \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}((t-\delta,t] \times O_\delta(x)) \ \text{ for some } \delta > 0, \text{ s.t.} \\
&\qquad u(t,x,\omega) - \varphi(t,x) = 0 = \min_{(s,y)\in(t-\delta,t]\times O_\delta(x)} [u(s,y,\omega) - \varphi(s,y)]\Big\}; \qquad (3.6)\\
\underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t,x,\omega) &:= \Big\{\varphi \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}((t-\delta,t] \times O_\delta(x)) \ \text{ for some } \delta > 0, \text{ s.t.} \\
&\qquad u(t,x,\omega) - \varphi(t,x) = 0 = \max_{(s,y)\in(t-\delta,t]\times O_\delta(x)} [u(s,y,\omega) - \varphi(s,y)]\Big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $O_\delta(x)$ denotes the $\delta$-neighborhood of $x$. We then define

**Definition 3.5.** *Let $u \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$.*

*(i) $u$ is called a viscosity $\alpha$-supersolution (resp. $\alpha$-subsolution) of PPDE* (3.1) *if, for $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.e. $\omega$, for any $(t,x) \in Q$ and $\varphi \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t,x,\omega)$ (resp. $\underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t,x,\omega)$), we have*

$$\partial^\omega_t \varphi(t,x) + f(\cdot,\varphi,\partial_x\varphi,\partial^2_{xx}\varphi)(t,x,\omega) \geq (\textit{resp.} \leq) 0.$$

*(ii) $u$ is called a viscosity supersolution (resp. subsolution) of PPDE* (3.1) *if it is a viscosity $\alpha$-supersolution (resp. $\alpha$-subsolution) of PPDE* (3.1) *for some $\alpha > 0$.*

*(iii) $u$ is called a viscosity solution of PPDE* (3.1) *if it is both a viscosity supersolution and a viscosity subsolution.*

**Remark 3.6.** (i) We require the same constant $\alpha$ for different $(t,x,\omega)$. Notice that the set $\hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}((t_1,t_2] \times O)$ is increasing when $\alpha$ decreases. Then, for $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, a viscosity $\alpha_2$-supersolution must be a viscosity $\alpha_1$-supersolution. Therefore, $u$ is viscosity supersolution if and only if there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $u$ is a viscosity $\alpha$-supersolution for all $\alpha < \alpha_0$.

(ii) Since the paths of Brownian motions are Hölder $\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$ continuous for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we may actually fix an $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ in this paper and all our results will still hold true, after some obvious modifications.

(iii) As standard in PDE literature, one may use semicontinuous functions for viscosity subsolutions/supersolutions. We consider only continuous ones for simplicity. ■

**Remark 3.7.** To end this subsection we should point out that, in light of the standard viscosity theory, it is tempting to define the notion of viscosity solution in an alternative way via the notion of (stochastic) *parabolic jets*. For example, for any $\alpha > 0$, $u \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$, $(t,x,\omega) \in Q \times \Omega$, we can denote

$$J^{2,+}_\alpha u(t,x,\omega) := \Big\{(a,z,\gamma) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{S}^{d'} : \text{ for all } (\delta,h) \in (0,t) \times \mathbb{R}^{d'}, \qquad (3.7)$$
$$u(t-\delta, x+h) \le u(t,x) + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(t,x,u(t,x),z,\gamma,a) + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big)\Big\}.$$

Then, we can say that $u \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$ is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (3.1) if there exists $\alpha > 0$, such that for $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.e. $\omega$, it holds that

$$a - f(t,x,\omega,u(t,x,\omega),z,\gamma) \le 0, \quad (a,z,\gamma) \in J^{2,+}_\alpha u(t,x,\omega), \ \forall (t,x) \in Q. \qquad (3.8)$$

Similarly we may denote $J^{2,-}_\alpha u(t,x,\omega)$ and then define viscosity supersolutions.

However, unlike the deterministic viscosity solution theory, in which the definition via "jets" is equivalent to the one defined via test functions as in Definition 3.5, in the PPDE case the former definition is weaker than the latter. More precisely, for any $\varphi \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t,x,\omega)$, one checks straightforwardly that $(\partial^\omega_t \varphi, \partial_x \varphi, \partial^2_{xx}\varphi)(t,x) \in J^{2,+}_\alpha u(t,x,\omega)$. Thus $u$ being a viscosity subsolution in the sense of (3.8) implies that it is a viscosity subsolution in the sense of Definition 3.5. However, the opposite implication is not necessary true, as the $\omega$-wisely defined jets may not be "aggregatable" to a random field, much less having the desired regularity (in $(t,x)$). In fact, under the definition (3.8), we can only prove the stability result in a very special linear case $g(t,x,y,z) = cz + g_0(t)$, where $c$ is a constant matrix. The result that we prove in the following sections is obviously much more general, due largely to the "localized" temporal derivative $\partial^\omega_t \varphi$ introduced in Definition 3.5. ■

### 3.3 Consistency of the viscosity solution

In this subsection we justify our definition of viscosity solution by arguing that a classical solution must be a viscosity solution in the sense of Definition 3.5. We have the following *consistency* result.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let Assumption 2.3 hold and* $u \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_g(\Lambda)$. *Then* $u$ *is a classical subsolution (resp. supersolution) of PPDE* (3.1) *if and only if* $u$ *is a viscosity subsolution (resp. supersolution) of PPDE* (3.1).

**Proof** We shall only argue for subsolutions, the case for super solutions can be proved similarly. We begin by assuming that $u$ is an $\alpha$-viscosity subsolution with a certain $\alpha > 0$. By otherwise choosing a smaller $\alpha$, we may assume without loss of generality that $u \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g}(\Lambda)$. Then it follows immediately from (3.5) that $u$ is a classical subsolution.

We now assume that $u \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g}(\Lambda)$ is a classical subsolution to PPDE (3.1). Recall from Definition 3.1 that for such $u$ there exists a set $\Omega_u \subseteq \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}_0(\Omega_u) = 1$, such that for all $\omega \in \Omega_u$, (3.2) holds. Further, since under $\mathbb{P}_0$ the canonical process is a Brownian motion, which has Hölder-$\kappa$ continuous paths for all $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we might assume without loss of generality that for each $\omega \in \Omega_u$, $\omega$ is Hölder-$\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)}$ continuous. Now let $\omega \in \Omega_u$, $(t,x) \in Q$, and $\varphi \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t,x,\omega)$. It is clear that

$$\partial_x \varphi(t,x) = \partial_x u(t,x,\omega), \quad \partial^2_{xx}\varphi(t,x) \geq \partial^2_{xx} u(t,x,\omega). \tag{3.9}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq [u(t-\delta, x+h, \omega) - \varphi(t-\delta, x+h)] \\
&= \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}\Big(\cdot, u, \partial_x u, \partial^2_{xx} u, \partial_t u\Big)(t,x,\omega) - \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}\Big(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x\varphi, \partial^2_{xx}\varphi, \partial^\omega_t \varphi\Big)(t,x) + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big) \\
&= -[\partial_t u(t,x,\omega) - \partial^\omega_t \varphi(t,x)]\delta \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}[\partial^2_{xx} u(t,x,\omega) - \partial^2_{xx}\varphi(t,x)] : (h - g_z B_{t-\delta,t})(h - g_z B_{t-\delta,t})^T + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $h := g_z B_{t-\delta,t}$, we obtain that

$$-[\partial_t u(t,x,\omega) - \partial^\omega_t \varphi(t,x)]\delta \quad \leq \quad o\big([\delta + |B_{t-\delta,t}|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big).$$

Since $\omega$ is Hölder-$\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)}$ continuous, we have $o\big([\delta + |B_{t-\delta,t}|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big) = o(\delta)$, which then implies that $\partial_t u(t,x,\omega) \geq \partial^\omega_t \varphi(t,x)$. Consequently, recalling Assumption 2.3 and (3.9), and noting that $u$ is a classical subsolution, we obtain that, at $(t,x,\omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^\omega_t \varphi(t,x) - f(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x\varphi, \partial^2_{xx}\varphi)(t,x,\omega) &\leq \Big[\partial_t u - f(\cdot, u, \partial_x u, \partial^2_{xx} u)\Big](t,x,\omega) \\
&= \mathcal{L}u(t,x,\omega) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

That is, $u$ is a viscosity subsolution, proving the proposition. ■

### 3.4 A change variable formula

As in the study of viscosity solutions, it is often convenient to assume that the coefficient $f$ is monotone in $y$ as well. In this subsection we show that such an assumption is essentially "free", given Assumption 2.3, by a simple change of variable formula. Furthermore, we shall verify that the viscosity solution is "invariant" under such change of variables.

To begin with, let $f$ and $g$ be a pair of given coefficients satisfying Assumption 2.3. Let $u$ be a classical solution of PPDE (3.1), and $\lambda : [0,\infty) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ an $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable bounded process. Denote $\eta_t = \int_0^t \lambda_s ds$, $t \geq 0$, and

$$\tilde{u}(t,x,\omega) := e^{\eta_t} u(t,x,\omega) := e^{\int_0^t \lambda_s ds} u(t,x,\omega). \tag{3.10}$$

One can then check directly that (suppressing variables)

$$\partial_t \tilde{u} = \lambda \tilde{u} + e^{\eta} \partial_t u,\ \partial_\omega \tilde{u} = e^{\eta} \partial_\omega u,\ u = e^{-\eta} \tilde{u},\ \partial_x u = e^{-\eta} \partial_x \tilde{u},\ \partial^2_{xx} u = e^{-\eta} \partial^2_{xx} \tilde{u}. \tag{3.11}$$

Now for $(t, x, y, z, \gamma) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{S}^{d'}$, we define

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{f}(t, x, y, z, \gamma) := \lambda_t y + e^{\eta_t} f\big(t, x, e^{-\eta_t} y, e^{-\eta_t} z, e^{-\eta_t} \gamma\big); \\ \tilde{g}(t, x, y, z) := e^{\eta_t} g\big(t, x, e^{-\eta_t} y, e^{-\eta_t} z\big). \end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

It is straightforward to check that $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g})$ satisfies Assumption 2.3, provided that $\lambda$ is continuous in $t$. Furthermore, plugging (3.11) and (3.12) into the PPDE (3.1) we obtain the following equations:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{u}(t, x) := \partial_t \tilde{u} - \tilde{f}(t, x, \tilde{u}, \partial_x \tilde{u}, \partial^2_{xx} \tilde{u}) = 0, \quad \partial_\omega \tilde{u} = \tilde{g}(\cdot, \tilde{u}, \partial_x \tilde{u}). \tag{3.13}$$

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let Assumption 2.3 hold and $\lambda$ be bounded and continuous in $t$. Then $u \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$ is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE* (3.1) *if and only if $\tilde{u}$ is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE* (3.13)*.*

**Proof** We shall prove only one direction, and the other direction is similar. Assume $u$ is a viscosity $\alpha$-subsolution of PPDE (3.1). Let $\omega \in \Omega$ be such that $u$ satisfies the viscosity subsolution property at $\omega$. For any $(t_0, x_0) \in Q$ and $\tilde{\varphi} \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha \tilde{u}(t_0, x_0, \omega)$ with corresponding $\delta_0 > 0$, denote

$$\varphi(t, x) := e^{-\eta_t} \tilde{\varphi}(t, x), \quad \partial^\omega_t \varphi := e^{-\eta_t} [\partial^\omega_t \tilde{\varphi} - \lambda \tilde{\varphi}](t, x). \tag{3.14}$$

One can check directly that (supressing the variables),

$$\partial_\omega \tilde{g} = e^{\eta} \partial_\omega g, \quad \partial_x \tilde{g} = e^{\eta} \partial_x g, \quad \partial_y \tilde{g} = \partial_y g, \quad \partial_z \tilde{g} = \partial_z g.$$

Therefore, recalling the definition of the operator $\mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}$ in (2.21) we can easily check that

$$\mathbb{T}^{\tilde{g}}_{\delta,h}(\cdot, \tilde{\varphi}, \partial_x \tilde{\varphi}, \partial^2_{xx} \tilde{\varphi}, \partial^\omega_t \tilde{\varphi})(t, x) = e^{\eta_t} \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x \varphi, \partial^2_{xx} \varphi, e^{-\eta_t} \partial^\omega_t \tilde{\varphi})(t, x).$$

Then, by assuming $\alpha$ is small and noticing that $u$ is locally bounded, for any $(t, x) \in (t_0 - \delta_0, t_0] \times O_{\delta_0}(x_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi(t - \delta, x + h) = e^{-\eta_{t-\delta}} \tilde{\varphi}(t - \delta, x + h) \\ = \ & e^{-\eta_{t-\delta}} \Big[\tilde{\varphi} + \mathbb{T}^{\tilde{g}}_{\delta,h}(\cdot, \tilde{\varphi}, \partial_x \tilde{\varphi}, \partial^2_{xx} \tilde{\varphi}, \partial^\omega_t \tilde{\varphi})\Big](t, x) + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big) \\ = \ & e^{\int_{t-\delta}^t \lambda_s ds} \Big[\varphi + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x \varphi, \partial^2_{xx} \varphi, e^{-\eta_t} \partial^\omega_t \tilde{\varphi})\Big](t, x) + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big) \\ = \ & [1 + \lambda_t \delta] \Big[\varphi + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x \varphi, \partial^2_{xx} \varphi, e^{-\eta_t} \partial^\omega_t \tilde{\varphi})\Big](t, x) + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big) \\ = \ & \Big[\varphi + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x \varphi, \partial^2_{xx} \varphi, e^{-\eta_t} \partial^\omega_t \tilde{\varphi}) + \lambda_t \varphi \delta\Big](t, x) + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big) \\ = \ & \Big[\varphi + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x \varphi, \partial^2_{xx} \varphi, \partial^\omega_t \varphi)\Big](t, x) + o\big([\delta + |h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big). \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the last equality is due to the fact that

$$\mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(\cdot,\varphi,\partial_x\varphi,\partial^2_{xx}\varphi,e^{-\eta_t}\partial^\omega_t\tilde{\varphi})(t,x)+\lambda_t\varphi(t,x)\delta=\mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}(\cdot,\varphi,\partial_x\varphi,\partial^2_{xx}\varphi,\partial^\omega_t\varphi)(t,x),$$

thanks to the definition of $\mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}$ (2.21) and the identity (3.14). In other words, , we conclude that $\varphi\in\hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}((t_0-\delta_0,t_0]\times O_{\delta_0}(x_0))$, which further implies that $\varphi\in\underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t_0,x_0,\omega)$. By the viscosity subsolution property of $u$ we have

$$\partial^\omega_t\varphi(t_0,x_0)-f(\cdot,\varphi,\partial_x\varphi,\partial^2_{xx}\varphi)(t_0,x_0,\omega)\le 0.$$

This leads immediately to

$$\partial^\omega_t\tilde{\varphi}(t_0,x_0)-\tilde{f}(\cdot,\tilde{\varphi},\partial_x\tilde{\varphi},\partial^2_{xx}\tilde{\varphi})(t_0,x_0,\omega)\le 0,$$

confirming the viscosity $\alpha$-subsolution property of $\tilde{u}$. The proof is now complete. ■

Since $f$ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in $y$, by choosing $\lambda$ sufficiently large (resp. small), clearly the coefficient $\tilde{f}$ is *strictly increasing (resp. decreasing) in* $y$.

# 4 Partial Comparison Principles for PPDEs

In this section we explore the *Comparison Principle* for solutions of PPDEs, a crucial tool for proving the well-posedness of viscosity solutions of PPDEs in the next section. As in the standard PDE literature, the main challenge lies in the comparison between a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution. Similar to the study of backward PPDEs in [11, 12, 13], the main building block of our arguments is the *Partial Comparison Principle*, that is, the comparison principle in which one of the solutions is classical. We should point out that throughout the next two sections we shall consider PPDEs in the most general fully nonlinear form, but impose some abstract conditions, as our purpose here is to provide a generic method to prove the well-posedness. Verifying these conditions is possible but by no means nontrivial, and we will give a more detailed accounts on this issue in our accompanying work [6].

## 4.1 Classical comparison

We begin with the following "classical comparison theorem" between classical sub- and super-solutions.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Suppose that Assumption 2.3 is in force and the coefficients* $f,g$ *are sufficiently smooth. Assume that* $u\in\mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda)$ *is a classical subsolution and* $v\in\mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda)$ *is a* *classical supersolution of PPDE* (3.1)*. If* $u(0,\cdot) \le v(0,\cdot)$*, then* $u \le v$ *on* $\Lambda$*. Moreover, if* $u(0,\cdot) < v(0,\cdot)$*, then* $u < v$ *on* $\Lambda$*.*

**Proof** In this proof we shall consider the SPDE in its Itô form (2.16)-(2.17). Following the functional Itô formula and the derivation of (2.16)-(2.17) one can easily get:

$$\begin{aligned} du(t,x) &= \Big[\mathcal{L}u + F(t,x,u,\partial_x u, \partial_x^2 u)\Big]dt + g(t,x,u,\partial_x u)dB_t;\\ dv(t,x) &= \Big[\mathcal{L}v + F(t,x,v,\partial_x v, \partial_x^2 v)\Big]dt + g(t,x,v,\partial_x v)dB_t. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $w := u - v$ and $\psi := \mathcal{L}u - \mathcal{L}v$. Then,

$$dw(t,x) = [\psi + F_y w + F_z \partial_x w + F_\gamma \partial_{xx}^2 w]dt + [g_y w + g_z \partial_x w]dB_t, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$F_y(t,x) \overset{\triangle}{=} \int_0^1 \partial_y F(t,x,\omega, v+\lambda w, \partial_x v + \lambda \partial_x w, \partial_{xx}^2 v + \lambda \partial_{xx}^2 w)d\lambda, \tag{4.2}$$

and we define the terms $F_z, F_\gamma, g_y, g_z$ similarly. Since $u, v \in \mathcal{H}_*^4$, we see that $F_y, F_z, F_\gamma, g_y, g_z$ are well-defined random fields. Moreover, in light of (2.17), writing $F_\gamma, f_\gamma$ and $g_z$ in the form of (4.2), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_\gamma &:= F_\gamma - \frac{1}{2} g_z [g_z]^T \qquad (4.3)\\ &= f_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 [\partial_z g (\partial_z g)^T](t,x,\omega, v+\lambda w, \partial_x v + \lambda \partial_x w)d\alpha - \frac{1}{2} g_z[g_z]^T \ge f_\gamma \ge 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we may view $w$ as a classical solution to the linear parabolic SPDE (4.1).

Our next step is to derive the Feyman-Kac representation formula for $w$. We remark that such a representation for SPDEs is frequently seen in the literature (see e.g. Rozovskii [31] for linear case and Pardoux and Peng [29] for semilinear case). However, these works require the differential operator $\mathcal{L}$ to be deterministic and thus cannot be applied to our situation. We shall instead apply the similar idea of Leahy and Mikulevicius [21] which deals with random coefficients. Since the notations are quite different, for completeness we sketch a proof below. We note that our argument is essentially "pathwise", and therefore more suitable for the PPDE framework. The main idea is still the *stochastic characteristics*. For simplicity, in the following discussion we shall assume all processes are 1-dimensional.

We begin by introducing the following SDEs:

$$\begin{cases} \theta_t(x) = x - \displaystyle\int_0^t g_y(s,\theta_s(x))dB_s, \\ \eta_t(x,y) = y + \displaystyle\int_0^t g_z(s,\theta_s(x))\eta_s(x,y)dB_s. \end{cases} \qquad t \in [0,T] \tag{4.4}$$

Since the coefficients $g_y$ and $g_z$ are $\mathbb{F}^B$-measurable random fields and regular enough, both equations in (4.4) should have unique solutions $\theta$ and $\eta$ that are $\mathbb{F}^B$-progressively measurable on $[0,T]$, which are known as the *stochastic characteristics*.

Next, let $M(x) = (M_t(x))_{t\geq 0}$ be the solution to the following SDE:

$$dM_t(x) = M_t(x)g_t(\theta_t(x))dB_t, \quad M_0(x) = 1, \tag{4.5}$$

then it is easy to see that $\eta_t(x,y) = yM_t(x)$, $t \in [0,T]$.

Now let $w$ be the classical solution of SPDE (2.11). Define $v(t,x) := M_t^{-1}(x)w(t,\theta_t(x))$, or equivalently,

$$w(t,\theta_t(x)) = \eta_t(x, v(t,x)). \tag{4.6}$$

Then $v$ is also $\mathbb{F}^B$-progressively measurable. Apply Ito-Ventzell formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} dw(t,\theta_t(x)) &= \big[g_y\partial_x w + g_z w\big](t,\theta_t(x))dB_t + \big[F_\gamma \partial^2_{xx} w + F_z\partial_x w + F_y w + \psi\big](t,\theta_t(x))dt \\ &\quad -[g_y\partial_x w](t,\theta_t(x))dB_t + \frac{1}{2}[\partial^2_{xx}w(g_y)^2](t,\theta_t(x))dt \\ &\quad -\big[\partial_x[g_y\partial_x w + g_z w]\sigma\big](t,\theta_t(x))dt \\ &= g_z w(t,\theta_t(x))dB_t + \big[\hat{a}\partial^2_{xx}w + \hat{b}\partial_x w + \hat{c}w + \psi\big](t,\theta_t(x))dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{a} := F_\gamma - \frac{1}{2}[g_y]^2$, $\hat{b} := F_z - [\partial_x g_y]g_y - g_z g_y$, $\hat{c} := F_y - [\partial_x g_z]g_y$. Thus, by (4.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_t(x)dv(t,x) &= dw(t,\theta_t(x)) + w(t,\theta_t(x))M_t(x)dM_t^{-1}(x) - [(g_z)^2 w](t,\theta_t(x))dt \\ &= \big[\hat{a}\partial^2_{xx}w + \hat{b}\partial_x w + \hat{c}w + \psi\big](t,\theta_t(x))dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Now note that $w(t,\theta_t(x)) = M_t(x)v(t,x)$, differentiating it (twice) we get

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} &\partial_x w(t,\theta_t(x))\partial_x\theta_t(x) = M_t(x)\partial_x v(t,x) + \partial_x M_t(x)v(t,x); \\ &\partial^2_{xx}w(t,\theta_t(x))|\partial_x\theta_t(x)|^2 + \partial_x w(t,\theta_t(x))\partial^2_{xx}\theta_t(x) \\ &\qquad\qquad = M_t(x)\partial^2_{xx}v(t,x) + 2\partial_x M_t(x)\partial_x v(t,x) + \partial^2_{xx}M_t(x)v(t,x). \end{aligned} \right. \tag{4.8}$$

Moreover, differentiating the first SDE in (4.4) we have

$$\partial_x\theta_t(x) = 1 - \int_0^t \partial_x[g_y](s,\theta_s(x))\partial_x\theta_s(x)dB_s,$$

which leads to that

$$\partial_x\theta_t(x) = \exp\Big\{ -\int_0^t [\partial_x g_y](s,\theta_s(x))dB_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |[\partial_x g_y](s,\theta_s(x))|^2 ds\Big\} > 0.$$

Therefore we derive from (4.8) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_x w(t,\theta_t(x)) &= \frac{1}{\partial_x\theta_t(x)}\Big[M_t(x)\partial_x v(t,x)+\partial_x M_t(x)v(t,x)\Big]; \qquad (4.9)\\
\partial^2_{xx} w(t,\theta_t(x)) &= \frac{1}{|\partial_x\theta_t(x)|^2}\Big[M_t(x)\partial^2_{xx}v(t,x)+2\partial_x M_t(x)\partial_x v(t,x)+\partial^2_{xx}M_t(x)v(t,x)\\
&\quad -\frac{\partial^2_{xx}\theta_t(x)}{\partial_x\theta_t(x)}\big[M_t(x)\partial_x v(t,x)+\partial_x M_t(x)v(t,x)\big]\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging these into (4.7) we obtain

$$dv(t,x)=\Big[\bar a(t,x)\partial^2_{xx}v(t,x)+\bar b(t,x)\partial_x v(t,x)+\bar c(t,x)v(t,x)+\bar\psi(t,x)\Big]dt, \qquad (4.10)$$

where, by simplifying the notations: $\xi_t=\xi_t(x)$, $t\in[0,T]$, for $\xi=M,\theta,\cdots$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar a(t,\cdot) &:= \frac{\hat a(t,\theta_t)}{|\partial_x\theta_t|^2}, \quad \bar b(t,\cdot):=\frac{2\partial_x M_t\hat a(t,\theta_t)}{M_t|\partial_x\theta_t|^2}-\frac{\hat a(t,\theta_t)\partial^2_{xx}\theta_t}{(\partial_x\theta_t)^3}+\frac{\hat b(t,\theta_t)}{\partial_x\theta_t};\\
\bar c(t,\cdot) &:= \frac{\partial^2_{xx}M_t\hat a(t,\theta_t)}{M_t|\partial_x\theta_t|^2}-\frac{\partial_x M_t\hat a(t,\theta_t)\partial^2_{xx}\theta_t}{M_t(\partial_x\theta_t))^3}+\frac{\partial_x M_t\hat b(t,\theta_t)}{M_t\partial_x\theta_t}+\hat c(t,\theta_t); \qquad (4.11)\\
\bar\psi(t,\cdot) &:= M_t^{-1}\psi(t,\theta_t).
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that in the above all random fields are $\mathbb{F}^B$-measurable. From now on, to emphasize that the randomness depends only on $\omega$, we shall specify $v(t,x,\omega)$, etc. We now let $W$ be a 1-dimensional standard Brownian motion defined on another complete probability space $(\Omega',\mathcal{F}',\mathbb{P}')$, and consider the product probability space $(\overline{\Omega},\overline{\mathcal{F}},\overline{\mathbb{P}})$ where $\overline{\Omega}=\Omega\times\Omega'$; $\overline{\mathcal{F}}=\mathcal{F}\otimes\mathcal{F}'$; $\overline{\mathbb{P}}=\mathbb{P}_0\times\mathbb{P}'$. Then $W$ is obviously independent of $B$, under $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$. Furthermore, for random variables $\xi(\omega)$, $\omega\in\Omega$, and $\eta(\omega')$, $\omega'\in\Omega'$, we view them as random variables in $\overline{\Omega}$ by the identification: $\xi(\overline{\omega})=\xi(\omega)$; $\eta(\overline{\omega})=\eta(\omega')$, and $\overline{\omega}:=(\omega,\omega')$.

We can now derive the Feynman-Kac representation formula for $v$ in a more or less standard way. For any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}$, define the filtration $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^t_s:=\mathcal{F}^W_s\vee\mathcal{F}^B_t$, $0\le s\le t$, and consider the following SDE on $(\Omega',\mathcal{F}',\mathbb{P}')$ for fixed $\omega\in\Omega$:

$$X^{t,x}_s=x+\int_0^s\sqrt{2\bar a(t-r,X^{t,x}_r,\omega)}\,dW_r+\int_0^s\bar b(t-r,X^{t,x}_r,\omega)dr. \qquad (4.12)$$

We note that since $W$ is independent of $B$, we can consider (4.12) as an SDE on the space $(\overline{\Omega},\overline{\mathcal{F}},\overline{\mathbb{P}})$, whose coefficients are stochastic Lipschitz continuous. Thus, applying a general result [30, Theorem V.6] we obtain a solution $X^{t,x}$ of (4.12) on $(\overline{\Omega},\overline{\mathbb{F}},\overline{\mathbb{P}})$, such that for $s\in[0,t]$, $X^{t,x}_s$ is $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^t_s$-measurable.

Now let us define a process $\Gamma^{t,x}_s=\exp\Big\{\int_0^s\bar c(t-r,X^{t,x}_r,\cdot)dr\Big\}$ on $(\overline{\Omega},\overline{\mathbb{F}},\overline{\mathbb{P}})$. Then by definition of $\overline{c}$ and $X^{t,x}$, for $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$ we shall consider it as a $\{\mathcal{F}^W_s\}$-adapted process on $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$. A similar arguments as the standard Feynman-Kac formula then yields that

$$v(t,x,\omega) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\Gamma_t^{t,x} v_0(X_t^{t,x}) + \int_0^t \Gamma_s^{t,x} \bar{\psi}(t-s, X_s^{t,x}, \cdot)\Big|\mathcal{F}_t^B\Big](\omega). \tag{4.13}$$

To conclude, let $\zeta_t(x)$ be the inverse function of $x \mapsto \theta_t(x)$, then for $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$w(t,x,\omega) = M_t(x,\omega) v(t, \zeta_t(x,\omega), \omega). \tag{4.14}$$

Since $w_0 \geq 0$, $\psi \geq 0$, we can easily conclude from (4.11) and (4.13) that $v(t,x) \geq 0$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s. It then follows from (4.14) that $w(t,x) \geq 0$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s., proving the comparison theorem. ■

## 4.2 Partial comparison in the case $g = g(t,x,\omega,z)$.

The arguments for partial comparison principle is quite different from that for classical comparison. To this end, we shall first specify the boundary condition.

**Definition 4.2.** *Let $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$. We say that $u \leq v$ on $\partial\Lambda$ if*

$$u(0,\cdot) \leq v(0,\cdot) \quad \text{and} \quad \varlimsup_{|x|\to\infty} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} (u-v)(t,x) \leq 0, \ \forall T > 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.s.} \tag{4.15}$$

*Moreover, we say $u = v$ on $\partial\Lambda$ if $u \leq v$ and $v \leq u$ on $\partial\Lambda$; and $u < v$ on $\partial\Lambda$ if $u \leq v$ on $\partial\Lambda$ but it does not hold that $v \leq u$ on $\partial\Lambda$.*

We remark that in standard PDE literature, one only needs to specify the initial condition $u(0,\cdot)$ and certain growth condition as $|x| \to \infty$. For the ease of presentation, in this paper we require the asymptotic behavior of the solutions as $|x| \to \infty$, in the sense of (4.15). We hope to relax this requirement in future publications.

We first consider the case when the coefficient $g$ is independent of $y$, as in this case the proof is rather straightforward. We have the following partial comparison result.

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose that Assumption 2.3 holds and that $g = g(t,x,\omega,z)$. Let $u$ be a viscosity subsolution and $v$ a classical supersolution of PPDE (3.1). If $u \leq v$ on $\partial\Lambda$ in the sense of Definition 4.2, then $u \leq v$ in $\Lambda$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s.*

**Proof** In light of Proposition 3.9, we first assume without loss of generality that

$$f \text{ is strictly decreasing in } y. \tag{4.16}$$

It is worth noting that if $g$ is independent of $y$, then so is the $\tilde{g}$ defined in (3.12). Assume $u$ is a viscosity $\alpha$-subsolution and $v \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g}(\Lambda)$. Let $\Omega_0$ be a full measure set such that at any $\omega \in \Omega_0$, $u$ (resp. $v$) satisfies the viscosity subsolution (resp. classical supersolution) property, and the convergence in Definition 4.2 holds.

Suppose the assertion of the Proposition is not true. Then there must exist $(t_0, x_0, \omega^0) \in \Lambda$ such that $\omega^0 \in \Omega_0$ and $(u-v)(t_0, x_0, \omega^0) > 0$. Denote

$$c := \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}} (u-v)(t,x,\omega^0) \geq (u-v)(t_0,x_0,\omega^0) > 0.$$

By the boundary condition, there exists a compact set $K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ such that $(u-v)(t,x,\omega^0) \leq \frac{c}{2}$ for all $(t,x) \in [0,t_0]\times(\mathbb{R}^{d'}\backslash K)$. Then $c = \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,t_0]\times K}(u-v)(t,x,\omega^0)$. The compactness of $[0,t_0]\times K$ implies that there exists $(t^*,x^*) \in [0,t_0]\times K$ such that $(u-v)(t^*,x^*,\omega^0) = c$. Since $u(0,\cdot) \leq v(0,\cdot)$, we have $t^* > 0$. Then, denoting $\varphi := v(\cdot,\omega^0) + c$, we have $\partial_x\varphi = \partial_x v$, $\partial_{xx}\varphi = \partial_{xx} v$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(t-\delta, x+h) &= \varphi(t,x) + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}\Big(\cdot, v, \partial_x v, \partial^2_{xx} v, \partial_t v\Big)(t,x,\omega^0) + o\big([\delta+|h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big) \quad (4.17)\\ &= \varphi(t,x) + \mathbb{T}^g_{\delta,h}\Big(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x \varphi, \partial^2_{xx} \varphi, \partial_t v\Big)(t,x,\omega^0) + o\big([\delta+|h|^2]^{1+\alpha}\big), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality used the assumption that $g$ is independent of $y$. This implies that $\varphi \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t^*,x^*,\omega^0)$ with $\partial_t^{\omega^0}\varphi = \partial_t v(\cdot,\omega^0)$. By the classical supersolution property of $v$ and the viscosity subsolution property of $u$, we have

$$\Big[\partial_t v - f(\cdot,\omega^0,v,\partial_x v,\partial^2_{xx}v)\Big](t^*,x^*) \geq 0 \geq \Big[\partial_t v - f(\cdot,\omega^0,u,\partial_x v,\partial^2_{xx}v)\Big](t^*,x^*),$$

a contradiction with the strict monotonicity (4.16). ■

## 4.3 Partial comparison in the general case.

We now consider the general case when $g = g(t,x,\omega,y,z)$. Since in this case the function $g$ depends on the solution $v$ (i.e., the variable $y$), the last equality of (4.17) breaks down. We therefore need a different approach. Denote

$$Q^t_\delta := [t,t+\delta]\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}, \quad \Lambda^t_\delta := Q^t_\delta\times\Omega, \qquad \text{for } t\geq 0, \delta > 0. \tag{4.18}$$

We begin by observing that in a partial comparison, one of the solutions is a classical one. In fact, as we shall see in the next subsection for the full comparison, it is sufficient to consider a rather smooth one. Thus in the rest of the argument we shall assume that $v$ is sufficiently smooth. Define the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} f^v(t,x,\omega,y,z,\gamma) &:= f(t,x,\omega,v+y,\partial_x v+z,\partial_{xx}v+\gamma) - f(t,x,\omega,v,\partial_x v,\partial_{xx}v);\\ g^v(t,x,\omega,y,z) &:= g(t,x,\omega,v+y,\partial_x v+z) - g(t,x,\omega,v,\partial_x v). \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Clearly, $f^v(t,x,0,0,0)=0$, $g^v(t,x,0,0)=0$. Further, for any $\varepsilon>0$, let $\overline{f}^v_\varepsilon > f^v > \underline{f}^v_\varepsilon$ be certain approximations of $f^v$. Now let us consider the following SPDEs on $\Lambda^t_\delta$:

$$d\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon(t,x) = \overline{f}^v_\varepsilon(t,x,\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon,\partial_x\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon,\partial^2_{xx}\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon)dt + g^v(t,x,\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon,\partial_x\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon)\circ dB_t, \quad \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon(t,\cdot)=\varepsilon; \tag{4.20}$$

$$d\underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon(t,x) = \underline{f}^v_\varepsilon(t,x,\underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon,\partial_x\underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon,\partial^2_{xx}\underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon)dt + g^v(t,x,\underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon,\partial_x\underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon)\circ dB_t, \quad \underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon(t,\cdot)=-\varepsilon. \tag{4.21}$$

We observe that since $f^v(t,x,0,0,0)=g^v(t,x,0,0)=0$, it is readily seen that, when $\varepsilon=0$ the above SPDEs corresponding to $\overline{f}^v_0 := f^v =: \underline{f}^v_0$ have a classical solution $\overline{\theta}^v_0 \equiv 0 \equiv \underline{\theta}^v_0$. Define the following two sets:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{C}^{1,2}_{f,g}(\Lambda) := \Big\{ & v\in\mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda)\cap\hat{C}^{1,2}_g(\Lambda) : \forall t\ge 0,\ \exists\delta>0, \text{ such that, } \forall\varepsilon>0, \\
& \exists\overline{f}^v_\varepsilon > f^v \text{ such that (4.20) has a classical solution } \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda) \\
& \text{satisfying } \lim\nolimits_{\varepsilon\to0}\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon(s,x)=0, \forall(s,x)\in Q^t_\delta, \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.s.}\Big\};
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{C}^{1,2}_{f,g}(\Lambda) := \Big\{ & v\in\mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda)\cap\hat{C}^{1,2}_g(\Lambda) : \forall t\ge 0,\ \exists\delta>0, \text{ such that, } \forall\varepsilon>0, \\
& \exists\underline{f}^v_\varepsilon < f^v \text{ such that (4.21) has a classical solution } \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda) \\
& \text{satisfying } \lim\nolimits_{\varepsilon\to0}\underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon(s,x)=0, \forall(s,x)\in Q^t_\delta, \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.s.}\Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

We remark that the classical comparison Proposition 4.1 implies that $\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon > 0 > \underline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon>0$. We are now ready to give the main result of this section.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Suppose that Assumption 2.3 is in force. Assume that $u$ is a viscosity subsolution and $v\in\overline{C}^{1,2}_{f,g}(\Lambda)$ a classical supersolution of PPDE* (3.1)*. If $u\le v$ on $\partial\Lambda$, then $u\le v$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s.*

**Proof** Similar to Proposition 4.3, we shall focus on a set $\Omega_0\subseteq\Omega$, with $\mathbb{P}_0(\Omega_0)=1$, such that for every $\omega\in\Omega_0$, we have the following facts:

(i) $u$ (resp. $v$) satisfies the viscosity subsolution (resp. classical supersolution) property;

(ii) the convergences in Definition 4.2 hold; and

(iii) the convergence in (4.22) (resp. (4.23)) holds.

Again, we prove the result by contradiction. Suppose that the comparison fails. Denote

$$t_0 := \inf\Big\{t\ge0 : \mathbb{P}_0\Big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^{d'}}[u-v](t,x)>0\Big)>0\Big\}.$$

Let $\delta>0$ be that in (4.22) corresponding to $v\in\overline{C}^{1,2}_{f,g}(\Lambda)$ and $t_0>0$. Then there exists $(t_1,x_0,\omega^0)\in(t_0,t_0+\delta]\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}\times\Omega_0$ such that

$$c := \sup_{(t,x)\in[t_0,t_0+\delta]\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}}[u-v](t,x,\omega^0) = [u-v](t_1,x_0,\omega^0) > 0 = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^{d'}}[u-v](t_0,x). \tag{4.24}$$

Define $v^\varepsilon := v + \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon > v$ for the $\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon$ in (4.22). Then $u - v^\varepsilon \le -\varepsilon$ on $\partial\Lambda^{t_0}_\delta$ in the spirit of Definition 4.2, and $(u-v^\varepsilon)(t_1, x_0, \omega^0) \ge \frac{c}{2} > 0$ for $\varepsilon$ small enough. Similar to the proof of Proposition 4.3, there exists $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) \in (t_0, t_1] \times \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ such that

$$(u - v^\varepsilon)(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, \omega^0) = 0 = \max_{(t,x)\in[t_0,t_\varepsilon]\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}} (u - v^\varepsilon)(t, x, \omega^0). \tag{4.25}$$

Note that

$$\partial_\omega v^\varepsilon(t,x) = \partial_\omega v + \partial_\omega \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon = g(t,x,v,\partial_x v) + g^v(t,x,\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon, \partial_x\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon) = g(t,x,v^\varepsilon,\partial_x v^\varepsilon).$$

Then one may easily check that $v^\varepsilon \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_g(\Lambda^{t_0}_\delta)$, and thus (4.25) implies $\varphi := v^\varepsilon(\cdot,\omega^0) \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, \omega^0)$ with $\partial^{\omega^0}_t \varphi = \partial_t v^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^0)$. By the viscosity subsolution property of $u$, at $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, \omega^0)$ we have

$$\partial_t v^\varepsilon - f(\cdot, v^\varepsilon, \partial_x v^\varepsilon, \partial^2_{xx} v^\varepsilon) \le 0.$$

Therefore, at $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, \omega^0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}v &= \partial_t v - f(\cdot, v, \partial_x v, \partial^2_{xx} v) = \partial_t v^\varepsilon - \partial_t \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon - f(\cdot, v, \partial_x v, \partial^2_{xx} v)\\
&\le f(\cdot, v^\varepsilon, \partial_x v^\varepsilon, \partial^2_{xx} v^\varepsilon) - \partial_t \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon - f(\cdot, v, \partial_x v, \partial^2_{xx} v)\\
&= -\partial_t \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon + f^v(\cdot, \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon, \partial_x \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon, \partial^2_{xx}\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon) = -\overline{f}^v_\varepsilon(\cdot, \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon, \partial_x \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon, \partial^2_{xx}\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon) + f^v(\cdot, \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon, \partial_x \overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon, \partial^2_{xx}\overline{\theta}^v_\varepsilon) < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This contradicts with the classical supersolution property of $v$. ■

## 5 Well-posedness of PPDEs

We are now ready to prove the main well-posedness result of this paper. Again, since we are considering a general framework, we shall introduce some special assumptions that may not be immediately verifiable. The verification of these assumptions could be non-trivial in general, but as we shall see in our accompanying work [6], they are particularly true in the semilinear case.

We shall start with a stability result, for which we need the following assumption. Recall the function $g^\varphi$ is defined by (4.19).

**Assumption 5.1.** *For $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.e. $\omega$, for any $(t_0, x_0) \in Q$, $\delta_0 > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, and any $\varphi \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}((t_0 - \delta_0, t_0] \times O_{\delta_0}(x_0))$, $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $\delta_\varepsilon > 0$ and deterministic functions $\theta_\varepsilon \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g^\varphi,\omega}((t_0 - \delta_0, t_0] \times O_{\delta_0}(x_0))$, such that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\delta_\varepsilon = 0$ and*

*(i) $\theta_\varepsilon(t_0, x_0) < 0 < \inf_{(t,x)\in\partial([t_0-\delta_\varepsilon,t_0)\times O_\varepsilon(x_0))} \theta_\varepsilon(t,x)$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, where*

$$\partial\big([t_0 - \delta_\varepsilon, t_0) \times O_\varepsilon(x_0)\big) := \Big\{(t,x) \in [t_0 - \delta_\varepsilon, t_0) \times \overline{O}_\varepsilon(x_0) : t = t_0 - \delta_\varepsilon \text{ or } |x - x_0| = \varepsilon\Big\}.$$

*(ii) $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}[|\theta_\varepsilon| + |\partial_x\theta_\varepsilon| + |\partial^2_{xx}\theta_\varepsilon| + |\partial^\omega_t\theta_\varepsilon|] = 0$, locally uniformly in $((t_0 - \delta_0, t_0] \times O_{\delta_0}(x_0))$.*

**Remark 5.2.** In Assumption 5.1, instead of assuming $\theta_\varepsilon \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g^\varphi,\omega}((t_0-\delta_0,t_0]\times O_{\delta_0}(x_0))$ we can assume alternatively that $\theta_\varepsilon+\varphi \in \hat{C}^{1,2}_{\alpha,g,\omega}((t_0-\delta_0,t_0]\times O_{\delta_0}(x_0))$ which, by Definition 3.4, would imply that $\partial_\omega(\theta_\varepsilon+\varphi) = g(\cdot,\cdot,\theta_\varepsilon+\varphi,\partial_x(\theta_\varepsilon+\varphi))$. But this is by nature an SPDE-type of requirement, and in general it is difficult, if not impossible, to be simply justified in an $\omega$-wise manner using the standard argument. We shall explore this point further in our subsequent paper [6]. ■

In what follows we consider PPDE (3.1) with coefficients $f^n$, $n \ge 1$, and a common $g$.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let $\alpha > 0$, $(f_n, g)$ satisfy Assumptions 2.3 and 5.1 with the same $\alpha$. Assume that $u^n$ is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE* (3.1) *with coefficients $(f_n, g)$, and for $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, it holds that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}(f^n - f)(t,x,\omega,y,z,\gamma) = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty}(u^n-u)(t,x,\omega) = 0, \tag{5.1}$$

*locally uniformly for $(t,x,y,z,\gamma) \in \overline{Q}\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{d'}\times\mathbb{S}^{d'}$. Then $u$ is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE* (3.1) *with coefficients $(f,g)$.*

**Proof** First, by the local uniform convergence, obviously $u \in \mathbb{C}^0(\overline{\Lambda})$. For each $n$, let $\Omega_n \subseteq \Omega$ be such that $\mathbb{P}_0(\Omega_n) = 1$ and $u^n$ satisfies the viscosity subsolution property for all $\omega \in \Omega_n$. Let $\Omega_0$ be the subset of $\cap_n\Omega_n$ such that (5.1) holds and the paths are Hölder-$\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)}$ continuous. Then $\mathbb{P}_0(\Omega_0) = 1$.

Now fix $\omega \in \Omega_0$, $(t_0, x_0) \in Q$, and $\varphi \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u(t_0,x_0,\omega)$ with corresponding $\delta_0$. Let $\delta_\varepsilon > 0$ and $\theta_\varepsilon$ be given in Assumption 5.1. Then,

$$\sup_{\partial([t_0-\delta_\varepsilon,t_0)\times O_\varepsilon(x_0))}[u-\varphi-\theta_\varepsilon](t,x,\omega) < 0 < [u-\varphi-\theta_\varepsilon](t_0,x_0,\omega).$$

Thus, there exists $n := n_\varepsilon$ large enough, such that

$$\sup_{\partial([t_0-\delta_\varepsilon,t_0)\times O_\varepsilon(x_0))}[u^n-\varphi-\theta_\varepsilon](t,x,\omega) < 0 < [u^n-\varphi-\theta_\varepsilon](t_0,x_0,\omega).$$

Now let $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) \in (t_0-\delta_\varepsilon, t_0]\times O_\varepsilon(x_0)$ be a maximum argument in the following sense:

$$[u^n-\varphi-\theta_\varepsilon](t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon,\omega) = 0 = \sup_{[t_0-\delta_\varepsilon,t_0]\times\overline{O}_\varepsilon(x_0)}[u^n-\varphi-\theta_\varepsilon](t,x,\omega).$$

Then $\varphi_\varepsilon := \varphi+\theta_\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}^\alpha u^n(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon,\omega)$, and thus

$$\partial^\omega_t\varphi_\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon) - f_n(\cdot,\varphi_\varepsilon,\partial_x\varphi_\varepsilon,\partial^2_{xx}\varphi_\varepsilon)(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon,\omega) \le 0.$$

That is,

$$[\partial_t^\omega \varphi + \partial_t^\omega \theta_\varepsilon](t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) - f_n(\cdot, \varphi + \theta_\varepsilon, \partial_x \varphi + \partial_x \theta_\varepsilon, \partial^2_{xx}\varphi + \partial^2_{xx}\theta_\varepsilon)(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, \omega) \le 0.$$

Send $\varepsilon \to 0$ and note that $n = n_\varepsilon \to \infty$, we have

$$\partial_t^\omega \varphi(t_0, x_0) - f(\cdot, \varphi, \partial_x\varphi, \partial^2_{xx}\varphi)(t, x, \omega) \le 0.$$

That is, $u$ is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (3.1) with coefficients $(f, g)$. ■

We now turn to the well-posedness of the PPDE (3.1) with boundary condition $u_0 \in \mathbb{C}^0(\overline{\Lambda})$. The main idea is to approximate the parameters $f$ and $\varphi$ by smooth functions, for which the SPDE has smooth solutions, and then using the stability to obtain the candidate of viscosity solutions. To this end, let $\overline{f}^\varepsilon$ and $\underline{f}^\varepsilon$ be certain approximations of $f$, and $\overline{\varphi}^\varepsilon$ and $\underline{\varphi}^\varepsilon$ be some smooth functions. Again, we shall make some general assumptions for the sake of discussion. These assumptions will be verified in [6]. Recall (4.18) and consider the following SPDEs on $\Lambda^t_\delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} d\overline{u}^\varepsilon &= \overline{f}^\varepsilon(s, x, \omega, \overline{u}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \overline{u}^\varepsilon, \partial^2_{xx}\overline{u}^\varepsilon)ds + g(s, x, \omega, \overline{u}^\varepsilon, \partial_x\overline{u}^\varepsilon) \circ dB_s, \quad \overline{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) = \overline{\varphi}^\varepsilon; \\ d\underline{u}^\varepsilon &= \underline{f}^\varepsilon(s, x, \omega, \underline{u}^\varepsilon, \partial_x \underline{u}^\varepsilon, \partial^2_{xx}\underline{u}^\varepsilon)ds + g(s, x, \omega, \underline{u}^\varepsilon, \partial_x\underline{u}^\varepsilon) \circ dB_s, \quad \underline{u}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) = \underline{\varphi}^\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

**Assumption 5.4.** *There exist $\overline{f}^\varepsilon$, $\underline{f}^\varepsilon$ and $\delta > 0$ such that, denoting $t_i := i\delta$, $i \ge 0$,*

*(i) $\underline{f}^\varepsilon \le f \le \overline{f}^\varepsilon$ and $\overline{f}^\varepsilon \to f$, $\underline{f}^\varepsilon \to f$, locally uniformly for $(t, x) \in \overline{Q}^{t_i}_\delta$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s.*

*(ii) For each $i$, any $\varepsilon > 0$, and any smooth functions $\overline{\varphi}^\varepsilon, \underline{\varphi}^\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\overline{\Lambda}^{t_i}_\delta)$, the SPDEs in (5.2) have classical solutions $\overline{u}^\varepsilon, \underline{u}^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda^{t_i}_\delta)$, respectively.*

*(iii) Given $0 \le \overline{\varphi}^\varepsilon - \underline{\varphi}^\varepsilon \to 0$, locally uniformly for $(t, x) \in \overline{Q}^{t_i}_\delta$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s., we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}[\overline{u}^\varepsilon - \underline{u}^\varepsilon] = 0, \quad \textit{locally uniformly for } (t, x) \in \overline{Q}^{t_i}_\delta, \ \mathbb{P}_0\textit{-a.s.} \tag{5.3}$$

**Remark 5.5.** (i) The essence of Assumption 5.4 is that the SPDE (5.2) with smooth coefficients has a classical solution (in $\mathcal{H}^4_*(\Lambda^t_\delta)$), uniformly in $t$, when $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small. This is by no means clear, with the currently existing literature on SPDEs, except for probably the semi-linear cases.

(ii) There is an important difference between assuming the local existence (see (ii) in Assumption 5.4) and the global existence on $[0, T]$. That is, we do not assume that the local solutions can be "aggregated" into a global solution. ■

Under Assumption 5.4 we see that $\overline{u}^\varepsilon$ (resp. $\underline{u}^\varepsilon$) is a classical supersolution (resp. classical subsolution) of PPDE (3.1) on $\Lambda^{t_i}_\delta$. We now have the comparison principle immediately.

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let Assumptions 2.3 and 5.4 hold, $u_0 \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$, and one of the following two conditions hold:*

- *$g$ is independent of $y$;*
- *the $\overline{u}^\varepsilon$ and $\underline{u}^\varepsilon$ in Assumption 5.4 belong to $\overline{C}^{1,2}_{f,g}(\Lambda^{t_i}_\delta)$ and $\underline{C}^{1,2}_{f,g}(\Lambda^{t_i}_\delta)$, respectively.*

*Then the comparison principle of viscosity solution holds. That is, for a viscosity subsolution $u$ and a viscosity supersolution $v$ of PPDE* (3.1)*, if $u \le u_0 \le v$ on $\partial\Lambda$, then $u \le v$, $\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s. Consequently, the PPDE* (3.1) *has at most one viscosity solution with initial condition $u_0$.*

**Proof** By partial comparison principle Propositions 4.3 and 4.4, we have $u \le \overline{u}^\varepsilon$ and $\underline{u}^\varepsilon \le v$. Then, by sending $\varepsilon \to 0$, it follows immediately from (5.3) that $u \le v$. ■

Moreover, we have the existence of viscosity solutions.

**Theorem 5.7.** *Let Assumptions 2.3, 5.1, and 5.4 hold, and $u_0 \in \mathbb{C}^0(\Lambda)$. Then PPDE* (3.1) *with initial condition $u_0$ has a viscosity solution $u$.*

**Proof** Fix $\delta > 0$ as in Assumption 5.4. By induction on $i$, it suffices to prove the results on $[t_0, t_1]$. Let $u_0^\varepsilon$ be a standard mollifier of $u_0$ such that

$$|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0| \le \varepsilon^2, \quad \text{and set} \quad \overline{u}_0^\varepsilon := u_0^\varepsilon + \varepsilon, \quad \underline{u}_0^\varepsilon := u_0^\varepsilon - \varepsilon.$$

Then, for $\varepsilon$ small enough,

$$u_0 - \varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \le \underline{u}_0^\varepsilon \le u_0 - \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 \le u_0 \le u_0 + \varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \le \overline{u}_0^\varepsilon \le u_0 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2. \tag{5.4}$$

For any $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0,1]$, we have $\underline{u}_0^{\varepsilon_1} \le u_0 \le \overline{u}_0^{\varepsilon_2}$, $\underline{f}^{\varepsilon_1} \le f \le \overline{f}^{\varepsilon_2}$. By classical comparison Proposition 4.1 we have $\underline{u}^{\varepsilon_1} \le \overline{u}^{\varepsilon_2}$. Then $\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon\to 0} \underline{u}^\varepsilon \le \underline{\lim}_{\varepsilon\to 0} \overline{u}^\varepsilon$, and thus (5.3) leads to

$$u := \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \underline{u}^\varepsilon = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \overline{u}^\varepsilon \text{ exists}, \mathbb{P}_0\text{-a.s.} \tag{5.5}$$

Now it follows immediately from stability Theorem 5.3 that $u$ is a viscosity solution. ■

We should mention that in the proof above we have used the quite strong Assumptions 5.1 and 5.4 for the existence of general PPDEs. In the cases where we have a representation for the candidate solution, however, it is rather straightforward to verify its viscosity property without using these strong assumptions, as we will see in [6].

**Remark 5.8.** (i) One typical way to construct $\overline{f}^\varepsilon$ and $\underline{f}^\varepsilon$ is through mollification. That is, let $f^\varepsilon$ be certain smooth mollification of $f$ such that $|f^\varepsilon - f| \le \varepsilon$, then we may set:

$$\overline{f}^\varepsilon := f^\varepsilon + \varepsilon, \quad \underline{f}^\varepsilon := f^\varepsilon - \varepsilon. \tag{5.6}$$

(ii) If we set $\overline{f}^{\varepsilon}$, $\underline{f}^{\varepsilon}$ as above, then the condition (5.3) is redundant when $g$ is independent of $y$. Indeed, assume without loss of generality the monotone condition (4.16). Set

$$u^{\varepsilon}(t,x,\omega) := \underline{u}^{\varepsilon}(t,x,\omega) + 2\varepsilon(t+1).$$

Then $u^{\varepsilon} \geq \overline{u}^{\varepsilon}$ on $\partial\Lambda$, and

$$\begin{aligned} du^{\varepsilon}(t,x,\omega) &= d\underline{u}^{\varepsilon}(t,x,\omega) + 2\varepsilon dt \\ &= g(\cdot,\underline{u}_x^{\varepsilon})(t,x,\omega) \circ dB_t + \Big[\underline{f}_{\varepsilon}(t,x,\omega,\underline{u}^{\varepsilon},\underline{u}_x^{\varepsilon},\underline{u}_{xx}^{\varepsilon})(t,x,\omega) + 2\varepsilon\Big]dt \\ &= g(\cdot,u_x^{\varepsilon})(t,x,\omega) \circ dB_t + \overline{f}_{\varepsilon}(t,x,\omega,u^{\varepsilon} - 2\varepsilon t - 2\varepsilon, u_x^{\varepsilon}, u_{xx}^{\varepsilon})(t,x,\omega)dt. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.16) it is clear that $\overline{f}_{\varepsilon}$ is also decreasing, then

$$du^{\varepsilon}(t,x,\omega) \geq g(\cdot,u_x^{\varepsilon})(t,x,\omega) \circ dB_t + \overline{f}_{\varepsilon}(t,x,\omega,u^{\varepsilon},u_x^{\varepsilon},u_{xx}^{\varepsilon})(t,x,\omega)dt.$$

Now by classical comparison Proposition 4.1 we have $\overline{u}^{\varepsilon} \leq u^{\varepsilon}$. Thus

$$0 \leq [\overline{u}^{\varepsilon} - \underline{u}^{\varepsilon}](t,x,\omega) \leq [u^{\varepsilon} - \underline{u}^{\varepsilon}](t,x,\omega) = 2\varepsilon(1+t).$$

This implies (5.3) immediately. ■

## 6 Discussions

In this paper we introduce a new notion of stochastic viscosity solution for a fairly large class of fully nonlinear (forward) SPDEs. The main ingredient of the new definition is the *Pathwise Stochastic Taylor Expansions* via the path-derivatives in the sense of Dupire, and the associated pathwise analysis. Using the language of path-derivatives we equate the SPDE with a system of PPDEs, charactering both the "drift" and "diffusion" terms at the same time, which distinguishes the "forward" PPDEs and its "backward" counterpart in a rather significant way. Furthermore, with Taylor expansion as the index of regularity we reformulate the "classical solutions" to SPDEs/PPDEs, and also define the set of test functions. It turns out that with such a new definition we may analyze the basic properties of the viscosity solution and establish the wellposedness for general fully nonlinear SPDEs without having to remove the stochastic integrals.

It should be noted that throughout the paper we have made three major assumptions in addition to the standard assumptions, to help us carry out the arguments. They are Assumption 5.1, Assumption 5.4, and the assumption involved in the two important sets defined by (4.22)-(4.23). It is generally a challenging problem to verify these conditions, which will be the main purpose of our subsequent paper [6]. In particular we will try to verify these assumptions in the semi-linear case.

As we indicated in Remark 5.2, Assumption 5.1 essentially requires a pathwise analysis. In particular, there has to be an exceptional null set, outside which one can fix $\omega$ (and $(t_0, x_0)$) so that the desired property holds for all $\varphi$. The exceptional null set is thus independent of the choice of test function $\varphi$. Such an requirement seems to be hard to fulfill using the usual stochastic analytic arguments. A natural tool seems to be the rough path theory, and this in part motivated the recent work [18], where the functional Itô calculus used in this paper is extended to pathwise Itô calculus in a rough path framework. We believe that this will ultimately facilitate our discussion for the verification of Assumption 5.1.

Finally, as we mentioned in Remark 5.5, Assumption 5.4 and (4.22)-(4.23) essentially require the existence of local classical solutions for SPDEs with smooth coefficients. We refer to Krylov [19] and Mikulevicius and Rozovskii [28] for some results for semilinear SPDEs in this direction, and we shall explore more in [6].

# References

[1] Buckdahn, R. and Ma, J., *Stochastic viscosity solutions for nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. I*, Stochastic Process. Appl., **93**(2) (2001), 181–204.

[2] Buckdahn, R. and Ma, J., *Stochastic viscosity solutions for nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. II*, Stochastic Process. Appl., **93**(2) (2001), 205–228.

[3] Buckdahn, R. and Ma, J., *Pathwise stochastic Taylor expansions and stochastic viscosity solutions for fully nonlinear stochastic PDEs*, Ann. Probab., **30**(3) (2002), 1131–1171.

[4] Buckdahn, R., Bulla I., and Ma, J., *On Pathwise Stochastic Taylor Expansions*, Mathematical Control and Related Fields. Vol. 1, no. 4, (2011), pp. 437-468.

[5] Buckdahn, R., Ma, J., and Zhang, J., *Pathwise Taylor Expansions for Random Fields on Multiple Dimensional Paths*, preprint, arXiv:1310.0517.

[6] Buckdahn, R., Keller, C., Ma, J., and Zhang, J., *On Regularity of Forward Path-Dependent PDEs*, in preparation.

[7] Cont, R. and Fournie, D., *Functional Itô calculus and stochastic integral representation of martingales*, *Annals of Probability*, 41 (1) (2013), 109-133.

[8] Caruana, M., Friz, P. and Oberhauser, H., *A (rough) pathwise approach to a class of non-linear stochastic partial differential equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 28 (2011), 27-46.

[9] Diehl, J. and Friz, P. *Backward stochastic differential equations with rough drivers*, Ann. Probab. 40 (2012), 1715-1758.

[10] Dupire, B., *Functional Itô calculus*, papers.ssrn.com.

[11] Ekren, I., Keller, C., Touzi, N., and Zhang, J., *On viscosity solutions of path depedent PDEs*, *Annals of Probability*, 42 (2004), 204-236.

[12] Ekren, I., Touzi, N., and Zhang, J., *Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Parabolic Path Dependent PDEs: Part I*, *Annals of Probability*, to appear, arXiv:1210.0006.

[13] Ekren, I., Touzi, N., and Zhang, J., *Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Parabolic Path Dependent PDEs: Part II*, arXiv:1210.0007.

[14] Friz, P. and Hairer, M. (2014) *A Course on Rough Paths: With an Introduction to Regularity Structures*, Springer Universitext.

[15] Friz, P. and Oberhauser, H. *Rough path stability of (semi-)linear SPDEs*, Probab. *Theory Related Fields*, 158 (2014), 401-434.

[16] Gubinelli, M., Tindel, S., and Torrecilla, I. *Controlled viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear rough PDEs*, preprint, arXiv:1403.2832.

[17] Karandikar, R. *On pathwise stochastic integration*, *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 57 (1995), 11-18.

[18] Keller, C. and Zhang, J. *Pathwise Itô Calculus for Rough Paths and Rough PDEs with Path Dependent Coefficients*, preprint, arXiv:1412.7464.

[19] Krylov, N. V. *An analytic approach to SPDEs. Stochastic partial differential equations: six perspectives*, 185-242, Math. Surveys Monogr., 64, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.

[20] Kunita, H., *Stochastic Flows and Stochastic Differential Equations*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **24**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[21] Leahy, J. and Mikulevicius, R. *On Classical Solutions of Linear Stochastic Integro-Differential Equations*, preprint, arXiv:1404.0345.

[22] Lions, P.-L. and Souganidis, P. E. *Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., **326**(9) (1998), 1085–1092.

[23] Lions, P.-L. and Souganidis, P. E. *Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations: non-smooth equations and applications*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., **327**(8) (1998), 735–741.

[24] Lions, P.-L. and Souganidis, P. E. *Équations aux dérivées partielles stochastiques nonlinéaires et solutions de viscosité*, Seminaire: Équations aux Dérivées Partielles, 1998–1999, Sémin. Équ. Dériv. Partielles, Exp. No. I, 15, École Polytech, 1999.

[25] Lions, P.-L. and Souganidis, P. E. *Fully nonlinear stochastic PDE with semilinear stochastic dependence*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., **331**(8) (2000), 617–624.

[26] Lions, P.-L. and Souganidis, P. E. *Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations*, (Japanese) (Kyoto, 2001), Surikaisekikenkyusho Kokyuroku, **1287** (2002), 58–65.

[27] Ma, J. and Yong, J. *On Linear Backward Stochastic Partial Differential Equations*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, **113** (1999), 135-170.

[28] Mikulevicius, R. and Rozovskii, B., *A Note on Krylov's* $L_p$*-Theory for Systems of SPDEs*. Electronic Journal of Probability, Vol. 6, no. 12 (2001), 1–35.

[29] Pardoux, E. and Peng, S. *Backward doubly stochastic differential equations and systems of quasilinear SPDEs*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **98** (1994), 209—227.

[30] Protter, P. *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations — A New Approach*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1990.

[31] Rozovskii, B.L. *Stochastic Evolution Systems: Linear Theory and Applications to Nonlinear Filtering*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, 1990.